

**REMARKS**

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his findings and conclusions.

5

2. It should be appreciated that Applicant has elected to amend Claims 1, 29, and 56 and to cancel Claims 26 and 82 solely for the purpose of expediting the patent process in a manner consistent with the PTO's Patent Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (9/8/00). In making such amendments, Applicant has not and does not in any way narrow the scope of protection to which the Applicant considers the invention herein entitled. Rather, Applicant reserves Applicant's right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

15 **Hilton Davis / Festo Statement**

Amendments herein to Claim 29 were not made for any reason related to patentability. Changes were implemented to clarify the invention. The foregoing amendment is not related to the pending rejections; all amendments were made for reasons other than patentability.

20

3. Claims 1-82 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description.

**Claims 1, 29, and 56**

25 As to Claims 1, 29, and 56, Applicant amends Claims 1, 29, and 56 to clarify that:

- the input means are associated with at least one of a plurality of strokes and a plurality of phonetic characters;
- the user selection is alternatively associated with at least one of the plurality of strokes and the plurality of phonetic characters;

30

- the input method specific database being associated with at least one of a set of phonetic sequences and a set of stroke sequences;
- 5       • matching entries are found for at least one of stroke indices and phonetic indices; and
- matching ideographic entries are converted to for at least one of stroke indices and phonetic indices.

Support for the amendments is found in the application as filed at least at page 8, lines 13-15 where it is stated that the system allows the ideographic characters to be shared among different types of input methods, such as a phonetic-based input method and a stroke-based input method. In combination with original Claim 1, it is clear that the specification teaches that the input means is associated with at least one of a plurality of strokes and a plurality of phonetic characters. Similarly, support is found in the application as filed at page 8, lines 20-23 where it is stated that a plurality of input means are each associated with a plurality of strokes of phonetic characters. Further support is found in the application as filed at least at page 8, line 28 to page 9, line 3; page 9, lines 14-15; and page 9, lines 17-18. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1, 29, and 56 and all claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description are deemed to be overcome.

4.       Claims 1-25, 28-45, 47-53, and 56-80 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 6,073,146 (hereinafter "Chen") in view of U.S. patent no. 6,822,585 (hereinafter "Ni").

#### **Claims 1 and 56**


Applicant amends Claims 1 and 56 to incorporate all subject matter from directly dependent Claims 26 and 82, respectively, to clarify that one of the input sequence is associated with a special wildcard input that is associated with zero or one of any of the strokes and the phonetic characters. Claims 26

and 82 stood rejected only under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, which was addressed, *supra*. Hence, the subject matter of Claims 26 and 82 is deemed to be otherwise allowable. Accordingly, the current rejection of Claims 1 and 56 and all claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
 5 unpatentable over Chen in view of Ni is deemed to be overcome.

Claim 26 and 82 are cancelled from the application.

### Claim 29

10 As to Claim 29, respectfully the Applicant disagrees. As illustrated below, Claim 29 requires that each ideographic character is associated with an ideographic index. The ideographic index is in turn associated with both a plurality of stroke indices and a plurality of phonetic indices. In turn, both the stroke indices and phonetic indices are associated with an input sequence. In  
 15 this manner, a small memory limited device may support a single ideographic character data set associated by way of the ideographic index to both a stroke index and a phonetic index that are in turn related to user input.



20

As the inventors teach in the application as filed at page 7, lines 4-8 having only one ideographic data set is important as the size of the ideographic data set is usually very large and is difficult to support on capacity limited devices. The invention solves this problem by associating a single ideographic character set with both the stroke input method and phonetic input method. In  
 25 stark contrast, neither Chen nor Ni associate a single ideographic data set to a set of ideographic indices allowing a single stored ideographic data set to be

correlated via indices to both a stroke input method and a phonetic input method. The Examiner states at page 5, second paragraph of the current office action that in Chen indices are inherent between phonetic sequences and ideographic characters and further states that indices are inherent  
5 between stroke sequences and ideographic characters. Even if the stroke and phonetic indices are inherent, there is no suggestion of ideographic indices. It is the ideographic indices that allow the use of a single ideographic character set to be stored in memory and used with multiple input methods, thereby alleviating the storage problem in a capacity limited device, such as a  
10 handheld or reduced keyboard system. As neither Chen nor Ni teach or suggest an ideographic index, not all of the required elements of Claim 29 are taught by Chen in view of Ni. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 29 and all claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Ni is deemed to be improper.

15

Applicant amends Claim 29 to still further distinguish Claim 29 from the cited art by clarifying that the ideographic database contains a set of ideographic character sequences associated with a set of ideographic indices. Claim 29 is further amended to clarify that the set of set of ideographic indices correspond  
20 to both stroke indices having corresponding stroke sequences and phonetic indices having corresponding phonetic sequences. Support for the amendment is found in the application as filed at least in original Claim 1; page 11, lines 23-25; page 9, lines 20-23; and page 9, lines 4-11. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 29 and all claims dependent therefrom  
25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Ni is deemed to be overcome.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, the Application is deemed to be in allowable condition. The Examiner is therefore earnestly requested to withdraw all outstanding rejections, allowing the Application to pass to issue as a United States Patent.

- 5 Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the application, he is respectfully urged to contact Applicant's attorney at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30, 176

10

Customer No. 22,862